Sibley's extensive study of the graduate training of sociologists interested me both as a member of a combined department and as a member of a neighboring discipline, with its own problems of graduate training. I was curious to see whether comments I had heard from colleagues and students over the years with reference to our graduate program in sociology related to problems faced by sociologists elsewhere, and by and large I found this to be the case. I wondered to what extent anthropologists could learn from the experience of sociologists, and here I am less certain. In the following remarks, I shall address myself primarily to this second point.

No comparable study of anthropological graduate training has been carried out. However, a recent review of the field, entitled The Teaching of Anthropology (P. G. Mendlebaum, G. W. Lasker, E. M. Albert eds., American Anthropological Association, Memoir 94, 1963) covers at least some related ground, although no survey of the profession as such is involved.

Sibley indicates that sociology has been growing rapidly and that anthropology, among other neighboring fields, has had a more sustained growth. The fact is, that anthropology has had a virtually explosive growth, at first in the 1930's, but more particularly in the post-war period. Anthropology in the U. S. began as a research field, primarily in museums, and what teaching occurred, began at the graduate level. Undergraduate training came later, and with it the need to prepare graduate students for careers in teaching. Now there is talk of anthropology in secondary schools.
However, Anthropology, I believe, is still primarily research oriented, and here we need to point to a key difference between research in cultural anthropology and in sociology: data collection, as a rule, involves the researcher's absence from the campus, and frequently from the country, for a year or more. Part-time research may involve the analysis of the data or, more recently, comparative studies utilizing library resources. Basically, however, the research of the anthropologist, at least for a time, modifies his way of life drastically. One corollary of this observation is that there is little room for student research assistants in the collection of data, and where advanced students are taken, or sent, into the field, the research cannot be carried out as a part-time job, while course work is continued.

Sociologists frequently see only, or at least primarily, the social science face of anthropology. Physical anthropology, and some aspects of archaeology, however, connect anthropology with the natural sciences, and folklore, primitive art, ethnomusicology and culture history link anthropology with the humanities. Linguistics tends increasingly to be established as an independent department or division, as this is also currently the case at OSU. In such a diverse field there are, of course, both centripetal and centrifugal tendencies and the existence of a good many combined departments of sociology and anthropology has probably tended to strengthen the social science side. Yet this is only partly true, and more and more of the older combined departments in the larger universities are being divided. This year, this has been the case with UCLA and Michigan State, the latter being one of the very few which in the past had made
an attempt at integrating their programs of sociology and anthropology, and of maintaining staffs of approximately equal size in the two disciplines.

From the above, it becomes clear that the problems of graduate training faced by anthropology must necessarily be different from those of sociology. For example, many anthropologists feel that an undergraduate major in anthropology is not necessarily the best preparation for graduate work in anthropology. Indeed for specialization in physical anthropology, a heavy concentration in natural and biological sciences as an undergraduate is a virtual necessity. In Sibley's findings, two thirds of beginning graduate students in sociology have majored in sociology as undergraduates. While I have no comparable data, my guess would be that this is not likely to be true for anthropologists.

Sibley tells us that about twice as many graduate students in sociology stop at the M.A. degree than go on to the Ph.D. Many of these find employment outside of colleges and universities: 86% of the men and 80% of the employed women, while 35% of the women are not employed. He concludes from this:

A majority of graduate students in sociology today are individuals whose vocational destinations (as we have seen) and whose aspirations (as we infer) are nonscholarly.

I don't know whether the inference is entirely justified: I would like to know more about these terminal M.A.'s and about the large percentage of women with M.A. degrees who have not pursued their careers further.

Personal acquaintance with some of them leads me to think that there may perhaps be factors other than "aspirations" at work here. Be this as it may, the situation for anthropology is, I am sure, totally different. I lack comparable figures, but it is clear that there are few jobs available
for M.A.'s in anthropology as such as there are none for B.A.'s, except in the recently developing area of human engineering in connection with aero-space research, and these are limited to physical anthropologists. Indeed, some anthropology departments either do not offer an M.A., discourage their better students from taking an M.A. or use the degree primarily as a device for eliminating students judged unsuited for further training.

As a consequence of the heavy lead of terminal M.A.'s, Sibley finds graduate programs in sociology "ambiguous" since they are oriented both toward the needs of the terminal M.A.'s and the more scholarly needs of Ph.D. programs. A similar problem does not appear to exist for anthropology, for the reasons indicated above.

The statistics on various subjects cited by Sibley are interesting, and, I believe, a comparable study of anthropology would be useful. Some items seem, at first glance, surprising. Thus in mathematical training, which Sibley urges strongly, there is little difference between the averages for anthropologists and sociologists (but averages can be misleading...), both falling in the middle of a continuum from economics (most mathematical training among the social sciences) to political science (least).

The treatment of substantive matters, of the content of graduate programs, seems superficial to me, and there is little discussion of what is actually learned, little concern for subject matter and ideas. However, admittedly this is not the prime aim of the volume. Whatever its shortcomings, both graduate students and faculties can profit from a review of Sibley's findings.